

## **RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 14, 2005. Applicant amended claims 1, 8-11, 20, 27-30, 35, and 42-45. Applicant cancelled claims 6-7, 25-26, and 40-41. Claims 1-5, 8-24, 27-39, and 42-52 are pending examination

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 8-22, 27-36, and 42-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aronin**, U.S. Patent No. **6,454,650** and in view of **Klug** U.S. Patent No. **6,591,245**.

4. As to claim 1, Aronin teaches a system for providing personalized notification comprising:

a controller adapted to compare personal information and administrative information related to an event a user is participating in and further adapted to send a personalized notification to the user concerning the user's participation in the event (col. 9, lines 1-8).

Art Unit: 2155

Aronin teaches wherein the user is notified if they won through e-mail, Aronin does not explicitly teach wherein the user chooses their preferred notification method, which can be e-mail or telephone number or fax. Klug teaches media content notification via communication networks. Klug teaches wherein the user is able to specify notification criteria (col. 5, lines 48-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Klug into the invention of Aronin in order to allow the user to specify the preferred notification method. This will allow the user to select the notification medium that best suits them and one that they will have access to the fastest.

5. As to claim 2, Aronin teaches wherein the event is a lottery (see abstract).
6. As to claims 3, 22, and 37, Aronin teaches the invention as discussed above. Aronin does not explicitly teach wherein the event is sport or entertainment even.

Klug teaches Klug teaches media content notification via communication networks. Klug teaches wherein the user is able to get notification or announcements concert or other performance data (col. 2, lines 56-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Aronin so that notification can apply to any event whether it is lottery or sport or entertainment, because doing so will give the user access to the information at a faster rate as well as add convenience to the user that he or she will be kept up to date on the information that is important to them.

Art Unit: 2155

7. As to claim 8-11, 27-30, and 42-45 Aronin teaches the invention as discussed above. Aronin teaches wherein the user is notified if they won through e-mail, Aronin does not explicitly teach wherein the user chooses their preferred notification method, which can be e-mail or telephone number or fax. Klug teaches media content notification via communication networks. Klug teaches wherein the user is able to specify notification criteria (col. 5, lines 48-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Klug into the invention of Aronin in order to allow the user to specify the preferred notification method. This will allow the user to select the notification medium that best suits them and one that they will have access to the fastest.

8. As to claim 12, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 wherein the controller comprises a server (see Fig. 1).

9. As to claim 13, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 wherein the controller comprises an Internet server (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 1-7).

10. As to claim 14, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 further comprising a user database adapted to store the personal information (Fig. 1, system database 36).

11. As to claim 15, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 further comprising an administrative database adapted to store the administrative information (Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 56-58).

Art Unit: 2155

12. As to claim 16, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 further comprising a user network access unit adapted to send the personal information to the controller (Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 56-67).

13. As to claim 17, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 further comprising an administrative network access unit adapted to send the administrative information to the controller (Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 56-67).

14. As to claim 18, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 wherein the personal information comprises a lottery number (col. 7, lines 43-64).

15. As to claim 19, Aronin teaches the system as in claim 1 wherein the administrative information comprises a winning lottery number (Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 56-67).

16. As to claims 20-21, 31-36, and 46-52, these claims fail to add any new limitations and contain similar limitations as claims 1-19 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

17. Claim 4-5, 23-24, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aronin**, U.S. Patent No. **6,454,650** and in view of **Grey** U.S. Patent No. **6,473,707**.

18. As to claims 4-5, 23-24, and 37-39, Aronin teaches the invention as discussed above. Aronin does not explicitly teach wherein the event is an educational event or an exam.

Grey teaches a test executive program for organizing and executing test sequences to control instrumentation systems. Grey teaches notification of a user who is taking an exam (col. 20, lines 45-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Aronin so that notification can apply to any event whether it is lottery or an educational event or an exam, because doing so will give the user access to the information at a faster rate as well as add convenience to the user that he or she will be kept up to date on the information that is important to them.

### **Response to Arguments**

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 8-24, 27-39, and 42-52, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

20. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, applicant argues in substance that Aronin does not teach notifying a user using personalized and preferred notifications. Klug, however, teaches media content notification via communication networks. Klug teaches wherein the user is able to specify notification criteria for an event a user is interested in (col. 5, lines 48-67).

Art Unit: 2155

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to notify a user using personalized and preferred notifications as in taught by Klug in the system of Aronin, because both Aronin and Klug are from the same field of endeavor of notifying users of events that are important to them, and by allowing the user to specify the preferred notification method the user is able to select the notification medium that best suites them and one that they will have access to the fastest..

Applicant further argues that there is no motivation whatsoever to combine Aronin with Grey. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Grey teaches a test executive program for organizing and executing test sequences to control instrumentation systems. Grey teaches notification of a user who is taking an exam (col. 20, lines 45-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Aronin so that notification can apply to any event whether it is lottery or an educational event or an exam, because doing so will give the user access to the information at a faster rate as well as add convenience to the user that he or she will be kept up to date on the information that is important to them.

Therefore, Aronin in view of Klug and Aronin in view of Grey meet the scope of the claimed limitations